

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. XV. No. 18.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1809.

[Price 1s.]

ENGLISHMEN, bear in everlasting remembrance, the Cases of HAMLIN, the Tinman, and of LORD CASTLE-
 REAGH, the Privy Counsellor, Secretary of State, and Member of Parliament; and, unless you *clearly shew*
 to the world, that you feel as you ought, as to the decision upon those cases, a curse ought to stick to you
 and to your children, from generation to generation.

[673]

[674]

TO
 THE INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.
 LETTER I.

Lord Castlereagh and Philip Hamlin.

GENTLEMEN,

When, at our last County-Meeting, an objection was made to our introducing into our Resolution the affair of Lord Clancarty and Lord Castlereagh, you had the good sense to over-rule that objection, though made by sir Henry Mildmay, whom you were ready to thank for having done his duty, but, by whom you were not to be induced to resign the exercise of your rights and the use of your reason. Nor, can I refrain from observing here, that we, who have no party or selfish purpose to serve, must, if we mean to profit from the victory we have obtained, be very cautious how we give way to any thing like *thick-and-thin* support of any body. Sir Henry Mildmay did well in voting for Mr. Wardle amongst the 125; but, that is only one act; it is merely a single act; and is by no means sufficient to induce us to continue our praise of that gentleman, unless we find him steady in his endeavours to serve the country, and especially in his endeavours to rescue the nation from the degraded state in which it has long been. I do not wish to excite any suspicions with respect to this gentleman; but merely to settle this point: namely, that, for the good he *has done* we have given him our thanks, in terms the most handsome; but, that, we are not, for this reason, at all bound to praise him in future, and are perfectly free to express our real sentiments, be they what they may, as to his future conduct, and, of course, to *act* upon those sentiments. No, Gentlemen, let us keep ourselves free from all thick-and-thin engagements and attachments; let each of us exercise his own judgment; let each of us for himself make due inquiry, and act upon the decision of his own mind; let us not be persuaded or coaxed to do that which our own reason tells us is not right; let us form and preserve an attachment to

principles and not to *men*; above all, let us despise the watch-words of party; let us thus act, and you will soon see, that this county, in spite of all the dreadful influence of the Dockyards, the Barracks, and the Custom-House, will not only recover its independence, but will set an example to other counties. The reason why your voice has heretofore not been heard, is this; that you had no inclination to attend at county-meetings. The few who did attend saw that the object was merely a party one; that no good purpose was answered by an attendance; that a set of Resolutions, ready cut and dry, were passed without opposition; that the audience consisted, upon one occasion, of the slaves of men in power, and, upon the next occasion, of the slaves of men who wanted to get into power; that, in fact, you were only to give your voice for what one party or the other party sent down from London to be passed, and to be sent back again as being the *decision of the county of Hants*, when it was no more the decision of the real people of the county, than it was the decision of the inhabitants of the moon. No wonder that such meetings had fallen into contempt. The tradesmen and yeomen of the county despised the imposture; and it did not occur to them to take the trouble of exposing it. Recent events, quite sufficient for the purpose, indeed, have roused us. They have brought us together from all parts of the county; made us acquainted with one another; produced an interchange of friendship; and do very fairly promise to make us formidable to any man, or set of men, who shall dare attempt again to consider us as men of straw. Far be it from me to inculcate feelings of disrespect towards rank, family, or learned professions; but, one cannot shut one's eyes to glaring truths, and, it was impossible for any one not to perceive, on the 25th of April last, that the "*great men*" of the county did not appear to be much better able than we were to conduct the business which had called us together; and, to say the plain

Y

truth, not quite so able. To myself I take no merit on account of that day's proceedings; for, though I have been much more accustomed to writing than most of you have, and though I necessarily possess more knowledge, upon political subjects, than the greater part of you can have had leisure to acquire, still I am of opinion, that, out of the two thousand of you, who were present, there were at least one hundred full as able to state your rights to the meeting as I was. You, *all* of you, possess sufficient knowledge; and you want only the confidence to do it. This was the *third* county-meeting that I had ever been at, and it was the *sixth* time that I ever attempted to speak to a public assembly. No one could do it with greater reluctance; but, it being the duty of some one to assert our rights, and I, seeing no other person disposed to get the better of that reluctance which was common to us all, resolved to do it myself, and, in this respect, to set you an example. I knew that the county had sense and spirit, and I was determined to give them a fair chance of displaying themselves; and, to your honour, display themselves they did.—Some of the hireling writers, in London, frantic at the result of our meeting, have abused me without measure, and have expressed their utter astonishment, that the "*noblemen and gentlemen*" of the county should suffer you to be *led* by a person like me. Now, in the first place, you were *not* led by me. You assembled without my asking a soul of you to attend. Forty-nine out of every fifty of you were perfect strangers to me; and, I am sincerely convinced, that not a man of you would have voted for the Resolution that I proposed, if you had not approved of it in your own mind. And, in the next place, "*the noblemen and gentlemen*" of the county have no such power over you as these hireling London-writers seem to suppose they have. You stand in no need of their support or assistance, or good-offices, in any way whatever. They come, indeed, at every *canvassing* season, and give you a hypocritical smile, and a squeeze of the hand; but this they do to the vilest knave in the county, who has a freehold of forty shillings a year, and whose family, perhaps, you have to maintain out of the poor-rates, while he maintains himself in idleness and drink by depredations upon your property of various descriptions. Besides, there is this wide difference between me and those "*noblemen and gentlemen*," of whom these writers speak: long

experience has convinced you, that they have always some selfish object in view; that they wish you to give them your support, in order that they, by the use they make of the power you put in their hands, may get something for themselves or their families. This you know well; whereas, you are all convinced, that I have no such views; that I do not want, and will not have, any thing from the public; and, therefore, you expect, and meet with, from me, plain dealing; that which is for the good of us all, without respect to persons or party. But, at any rate, our abusers are in a very pinching dilemma with respect to me and you; for, they must agree to one of two things; namely, either that *I am a person of very great consequence* in the county; or, that the Resolution which I proposed and you adopted *contained the genuine expression of your minds*. I know that the latter is the truth; but, let those who would fain vilify me and my principles, hitch themselves upon whichever horn of the dilemma they may feel to be the least galling.

I shall now address you, though it need not be at much length, upon the subject of Lord CASTLEREAGH's conduct, which subject made part of the Resolution, passed at the meeting.—Sir Henry Mildmay requested us to stop, '*till that matter had received the decision of the House of Commons*. But, as we had before us, a Copy of the whole of the Evidence in the case, printed by order of the House of Commons itself, we thought it not at all necessary to wait for that decision, supposing ourselves to be full as able as that House to decide upon a plain matter of fact; especially as we simply declared what was contained in the evidence itself, and contrasted the conduct of this Lord with the principles of the constitution, as contained in the BILL OF RIGHTS, which is one of our great constitutional laws.—On the same day, that we passed our Resolution, the House of Commons discussed, and decided upon, the conduct of Lord Castlereagh; and I beg leave to state to you what was done by the House upon that occasion.—The business was brought forward by LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON, who concluded his speech with moving the following Resolutions:—
"I. That it appears to the House, from the evidence on the table, that Lord Viscount Castlereagh, in the year 1805, shortly after he had quitted the situation of President of the Board of Control, and being a Privy Counsellor and Secretary of

677] "State, did place at the disposal of Lord
 "Clancarty, a Member of the same Board,
 "the nomination to a Writership, in order
 "to facilitate his procuring a Seat in Par-
 "liament.—II. That it was owing to a
 "disagreement among the subordinate
 "parties, that this transaction did not take
 "effect; and—III. That by this con-
 "duct Lord Castlereagh had been guilty
 "of a gross violation of his duty as a Ser-
 "vant of the Crown; an abuse of his pa-
 "tronage as President of the Board of
 "Control: and an attack upon the purity
 "of that House."—In opposition to
 these Resolutions, a LORD BINNING, one of
 the friends of the ministers, moved the
Order of the Day; that is to say, to drop
 the matter, without any further inquiry or
 discussion; or, in other words, to decide,
 that it was a matter not of importance
 enough to occupy the attention of the *House of*
Commons! Most of the members, however,
 did think that it was a little too bad;
 and that *some little notice*, some little cen-
 sure, ought to be pronounced.—The ques-
 tion was taken upon Lord Archibald Ham-
 iltion's Resolutions, and it was *negatived*,
 there being 167 for it, and 216 against it.
 So, you see, it was determined by the
 Honourable House, that this act on the part
 of one of its members, was not "an at-
 tack upon its PURITY;" in the justice
 of which determination I most heartily
 join.—Bravo! Well done Honourable
 House! "If this does not satisfy the
 "country," as Mr. Fuller said, "I don't
 "know what the devil will satisfy it."—
 Well, but what did the House agree to?
 Why to this:—"Resolved, That it is
 "the duty of this House to maintain a
 "jealous guard over the *purity of election*;
 "but considering that the attempt of Lord
 "Viscount Castlereagh to interfere in the
 "election of a Member *has not been suc-*
 "cessful, this House does not consider it
 "necessary to enter into any criminal
 "proceedings against him."—English-
 men, this, this, *this* was what the Honour-
 able House agreed to. They came to a
 Resolution, that, *because* Lord Castlereagh's
 attempt HAD NOT BEEN SUCCESS-
 FUL, it was unnecessary to enter into
 "any criminal proceedings against him."—
 Now, then, let us see what was done in
 the case of PHILIP HAMLIN, the Tinman
 of Plymouth, who offered a bribe to Mr.
 Addington, when the latter was minister.
 —The case was this: In the year 1802,
 PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth,
 wrote a letter to Mr. HENRY ADDINGTON,
 the first Lord of the Treasury and Chan-

cellor of the Exchequer, offering him the
 sum of £. 2,000 to give him, HAMLIN, the
 place of Land-Surveyor of the Customs at
 Plymouth.—In consequence of this, a
 criminal information was filed, against the
 said HAMLIN, by *Mr. Spencer Perceval*,
 who was then the King's Attorney-Gen-
 eral, and who, in pleading against the of-
 fender, asserted *the distinguished purity of*
persons in power, in the present day. From
 the Bench great stress was laid on the
 gravity of the offence of *tendering a bribe*;
 of the baneful tendency of such crimes, in
 a moral as well as in a political point of
 view. The Tinman was found guilty;
 he was sentenced to pay a fine of 100
 pounds to the King, and to be imprisoned
 for three months. His business was ruin-
 ed; and he himself died, in a few months
 after his release from prison.—Hamlin
 confessed his guilt; he stated, in his af-
 fidavit, "that he sincerely repented of
 "his crime; that he was 40 years of
 "age; that his business was the sole
 "means of supporting himself and fami-
 "ly; that a severe judgment might be the
 "total ruin of himself and that fami-
 "ly; and that therefore, he threw him-
 "self upon, and implored, the mercy of
 "his prosecutors and of the Court."—
 In reference to this, Mr. Perceval, the pre-
 sent Chancellor of the Exchequer, observe,
 said: "The circumstances which the de-
 "fendant discloses, respecting his own situ-
 "ation in life and of his family are all of
 "them topics, very well adapted to affect
 "the private feelings of individuals, and,
 "as far as that consideration goes, no-
 "thing further need be said; but, there
 "would have been no prosecution at all,
 "in this case, upon the ground of personal
 "feeling; it was set on foot upon grounds
 "of a public nature, and the spirit in
 "which the prosecution originated, still
 "remains; it is, therefore, submitted to
 "your lordships, not on a point of indivi-
 "dual feeling, but of PUBLIC JUSTICE,
 "in which case your lordships will con-
 "sider how far the affidavits ought to
 "operate in mitigation of punishment."
 —The Judge, Mr. JUSTICE GROSE, in
 passing sentence upon this poor, petty, ig-
 norant offender, said: "Such a practice,
 "if permitted, would lead to mischief in-
 "calculable; for it might extend to every
 "office in the appointment of the great
 "ministers of the state, civil, military, and
 "ecclesiastical, and would supersede men of
 "ability and integrity, and place, in their
 "stead, the ignorant and corrupt."—
 Now, people of Hampshire; now, English-

men, who have been taught so highly to prize impartial justice, compare the decisions in these two cases; bear them in remembrance; and let them have a proper weight upon your conduct on all future occasions.—Hamlin's attempt, observe, *was not successful*, any more than that of Lord Castlereagh!—There needs no more than to state these facts to you. Your own minds will furnish an appropriate commentary.—Justice as well as future utility require that we should have upon record the names of those who spoke for, and against Lord Archibald Hamilton's motion. *For it*, the speakers were, Lord Archibald Hamilton, Mr. C. W. Wynn, Lord Milton, Mr. W. Smith, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Ponsonby, Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Tierney.—*Against it*, Lord Castlereagh himself, Lord Binning, Mr. Croker, MR. PERCEVAL (who prosecuted Hamlin), Mr. Bankes, Mr. George Johnstone, Mr. H. Lascelles, Mr. Windham, and Mr. Canning.

You will perceive, Gentlemen, that I mean to address a *series* of Letters to you; and the mode I intend to pursue is this. On every Friday, when I have a letter to you ready for publication in my paper of the next day, I shall send by post, copies of such letter, time enough for its insertion in the Salisbury Journal, the Portsmouth Telegraph, the Hampshire Chronicle, and the Reading Mercury, *of that same week*. If you set a value upon these letters, you will, of course, continue to have that paper which shall insert them regularly. I hope, and believe, that all the papers, which circulate in the county, will insert them, the editors appearing to me to be men of sound principles; but, if some of them should insert them, and some not, then those persons who set a value upon the Letters will, of course, take a paper that does insert them. If, contrary to my hopes and expectations, *none* of these provincial papers should insert them, then, I trust, that those amongst you, who take my Register, will *lend* it as widely as possible through their respective neighbourhoods. But, Gentlemen, if this could possibly be the case; if the influence of those, who are sucking away our very blood, could be so great as to obstruct the circulation of political truth in the county, through the accustomed channels; then we would show them, that we were not to be so baffled, and that we would soon have a provincial paper that should circulate such truths. All that I want to see circulated

is truth. No falshood; no calumny; nothing of personal spite. "Truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," without respect to persons, or to selfish interests; but this truth we will have circulated amongst us, in defiance of all that can be done by force or by fraud.—The editors of the provincial papers must acknowledge, that my proceeding is very fair; I shall write these letters for their papers as well as for my own; they will appear, if those editors choose, in their papers on the *Sunday*, and, in mine, they cannot reach any part of the county before that day. Copies of this Letter, for instance, will reach them all on *Friday* next, leaving them plenty of time to prepare it for the press. So that, if they all should, by the enemies of the county and the kingdom, be prevailed upon to endeavour to keep these Letters from your sight, they will have no reason to complain in case we resort to the establishment of a paper, which must be injurious to them.

I am, Your faithful friend,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 2 May, 1809.

P. S. Once more I beg leave in this particular manner, to request those gentlemen, who take the Register, and who approve of its contents, to *lend* it for the perusal of those of their neighbours who do not find it convenient to take it themselves. Every man, who reads useful truths, is a man made the better for that reading. The pulpit, which, some years ago, made the churches resound with politics, is now as silent as the grave upon political subjects. Smother! smother! smother! is the order of the day. To the Press we must now look; and to make the press really useful, those must now read, who did not read before.—Upon looking again over the *Resolutions* proposed by Mr. POWLETT, I perceive, that, owing to an error in copying them, the *three* which stand *first*, should have stood *last*. This is very material; because, by the transposition, *thanks to Mr. Wardle* is made but a secondary and inferior object, and a deeper dye of *party* is given to the whole. In justice, therefore, to Mr. Powlett, who, on so many accounts, is entitled to the respect of the county, I lose no time in correcting this error.

I had nearly forgotten one very material fact.—You remember, Gentlemen, when you called out: "Why is not Mr. CHUTE here to-day?" The answer was, that he was attending his duty in parliament.

—Well, then, gentlemen, if he was in the House of Commons on that day, he voted for Lord Castlereagh; for his name is not in the list of the minority upon that question; neither is the name of his worthy colleague, Mr. HEATHCOTE, in that list; so that, either they were not attending their duty in parliament, or they were both voting in direct opposition to the opinions of the county, that day expressed.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LORD FOLKESTONE'S MOTION (concluded from page 620).—This, as will be seen by a reference to the page here pointed out, was a Motion for the appointing of a Committee to make further inquiry into the *corrupt disposal of offices, &c.* And, it will be remembered, that it was opposed upon the ground of its being *too general; too sweeping; too widely wasting.*—I shall now insert what Mr. Canning is reported to have said upon that occasion, having, at the place referred to, taken sufficient notice of all the other parts of the debate.—After repeating what others had said about the difference between specific inquiries and general inquiries, Mr. Canning concluded thus: "He could not conceive for what rational or practicable purpose, this motion was brought forward. Was there no mischief in keeping a persuasion alive in the public mind, that it was the opinion of impartial men in that House, that so much rottenness and corruption existed in every part of the state, as rendered such an inquiry necessary? The motion held out no hope of immediate advantage to the people; but it held out the whole cast and class of public men to suspicion. They were all represented as eagerly struggling for places and power, and as having nothing in view but the emoluments of office. The emoluments of office! If there be any man who considered the labours of an official situation, the duties that were to be performed, the anxieties that were undergone, the warfare which a public man had to support, not only in that House, but from the malignity which assailed him out of it, and could think that these things were to be compensated by money, he did not envy such a man his feelings or frame of mind. If there was any man who could think so, it was to him a subject not of regret, but of pride, to be the object of the suspicion of such a man. The Noble Lord and his abet-

tors might succeed in fixing this imputation on all public men, and driving them from power; in rendering them a degraded class, that he and those who support him might succeed to that ruin and degradation. He could not agree to this WIDE-WASTING motion, without admitting the truth of assertions, for which he was persuaded there was no foundation."—Bless us! What a taking the gentleman appears to have been in! But, Reader; honest Reader, do you not remember, that this gentleman and all the rest of them *hailed inquiry; rejoiced at inquiry; were glad to their very souls that inquiry, public inquiry, inquiry the most extensive, had, by Mr. Wardle, been at last (as if they had been longing for it), brought forward in a "tangible shape!"* They seemed, then, as if they had had a month's mind for inquiry. Of course, Lord Folkestone expected, that they must be glad again at seeing another, and still more extensive, inquiry moved for; but, "no, thank you." They seem to think they have had enough for this time; and, therefore, if it is all the same to his lordship, they beg leave to decline any more, at present, of the *joyous* entertainment.—So, Mr. Canning, there is a *ferment* in the public mind, is there? Now, if it be so, *how came it there?* Has it grown out of empty words; out of the declamation of speakers and writers; or out of the *damning facts*, revealed at the bar of the House of Commons, and out of the well-known *decisions* upon those facts?—There is a general persuasion, is there, "that rottenness prevails in every part of the state?" Well, whose fault is that? But, this persuasion, which you allow to exist, is either *true or false.* Now, mind, the persuasion you do allow to exist, and you must allow it to be founded either in *truth or falshood.* If the former, surely an inquiry, detection, and appropriate punishment are necessary; and, if the latter, is not inquiry necessary, in order to shew the nation that it has been deceived?—There is no getting out of this, Sir.—You say, that there is *no ground* for the persuasion, that you allow to exist; well, then, my good Sir, why be in such a passion about it, and why not let this headstrong young Lord have his committee of inquiry, which, possibly, might keep him from other "*mischief?*"—Sir, Sir, the case is too plain; the case is so very plain, that there needs nothing to be done, either "out of doors" or in-doors, but merely to state the *facts* belonging to it.—Why,

Sir, as to all of you, on both sides, being "*represented*" as being "*eagerly struggling for places and power*," I really do not think it necessary to say any thing but this: that, if the representation be *not true*, I am greatly afraid, that a very ugly imputation must be taken to yourselves; for, I put it to yourself, Sir, whether both parties have not, a thousand and a thousand times over, *preferred this charge against one another*; a question which, I am sure, you must answer in the affirmative.—No, Sir, there is no one but a fool or a rogue, who is so unjust as to accuse any of you of "*having nothing in view but the emoluments of office*;" for, seeming to bear in mind the maxim of ST. PAUL, that it is being worse than a heathen to neglect one's own kindred, most of the public men of our day, with filial and paternal and conjugal tenderness, take care to make pretty decent provision for their mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, wives, children, and other relations; there being from the maxim of the Apostle only this trifling deviation, that he seems to have meant such provision to have proceeded from a man's own private means, while the provision we have here been speaking of proceeds from the means of the public, and those means, too, of which members of the House of Commons are, by the constitution, considered as the stewards.—Now, Sir, as to the "*warfare*," which you have to "*support*," in the House, I have first to complain, that you did not make honourable and grateful mention of *me*, when you were complaining of the toils and dangers of that warfare; for, has it not been a subject of constant complaint with me, that there were regular fights carried on in the House; grand pitched battles, upon days fixed on for the purpose long before-hand? Have I not been constantly lamenting the existence of a drilled and disciplined and embodied Opposition? Have I not a thousand times expressed my earnest wish to relieve the king's servants from this warfare by keeping them out of the House, upon the principles of the Act of Settlement? Have I not said again and again, that it is impossible for men, who sit up debating till two or three o'clock in the morning, to attend properly to the management of great state-affairs?—As to the "*malignity*," with which you are assailed out of the House, Lord Folkestone offered you a remedy for it; a complete remedy; inquiry, proof of innocence, and publicity of that proof. Why not print it, Sir? Print it, Sir;

"Print it, and *shame the rogues*?"—No, Sir, the noble Lord will not "*succeed in driving all public men from power*," by which you must have meant all the present holders of, and candidates for, power and place; these his lordship will no more drive from power, than the Wellesleys will, I fear, drive the French out of Spain; or than the Archduke Charles will drive the Duke of Dantzick out of Germany.—Before I dismiss this article, I cannot refrain from noticing one observation in the speech of Mr. Perceval (see page 613), namely, "*that it was not the punishment of past offences, which we should so ardently seek, as remedies and preventives of such abuses*."—Good; but, how came we to hear nothing of this, Sir, when you prosecuted HAMLIN, the Tinman of Plymouth, who had seen hundreds and thousands of advertisements of places under government for sale, and who was so ignorant a man, that when the warrant went down for apprehending him, he took it to be the *patent* for his place? How came we to hear nothing of this doctrine then, Sir, when you demanded his punishment in the name of PUBLIC JUSTICE, and when the judge pronounced sentence upon him for the sake of *example*?—It is very true, that our great object ought to be, the *preventing of future crimes*; but, Sir, this object is not to be attained by the suffering of past crimes to go *unpunished*; for, if this were the case, what justice is there in punishing sheep-stealing, or even murder? What would be said of a judge, who, when a man should be arraigned for burglary, were to say: "*It is not the punishment of past offences that we ought so ardently to seek, as the prevention of future offences*; and, therefore, we will not punish this man, nor will we even expose him to a trial?" What would be said of such a judge, Sir?—The public will answer this question for you, Sir; nor will they fail to come to a just decision upon the whole of the matter relating to the rejected motion of Lord Folkestone.—I trust, too, that that motion will produce full as good a national effect as if it had been carried, and as if the full inquiry had taken place. I trust, that the *reasoning*, which must, as to this matter, pass in the public mind, will supply the place of the searching object of the motion itself; I trust, that the conclusions which will, and which must be drawn, in the mind of every man of sense, will receive an impression so deep as never to be effaced; and I trust, that

we, by our fire-sides, shall frequently remind each other—That, on the 17th of April, 1809, Lord Viscount Folkestone moved, in the House of Commons, “that a Committee be appointed to inquire into the existence of the *corrupt disposal of offices in the state*; of the disposal of Commissions in the army *contrary to the regulations*; and also into the *practices relating to levies*,” that the said motion was REJECTED, there being only 30 members for it, and 178 against it; and that the persons who voted for it were these:

Lord Ossulstone	Samuel Whitbread, esq.
Lord Viscount Forbes	Lord Archibald Hamilton
Sir Wm. Lemon, bart.	C. C. Western, esq.
Sir T. Miller, bart.	H. Tracey, esq.
Sir John St. Aubyn, bart.	T. W. Coke, esq.
George Hibbert, esq.	Joseph Halsey, esq.
George Knapp, esq.	H. C. Combe, esq.
Thomas Foley, esq.	John Calcraft, esq.
J. Scudamore, esq.	Hon. C. Bradshaw
T. J. Symmonds, esq.	Lee Antonie, esq.
Thomas Creevey, esq.	Hon. W. Lambe
Lord Althorpe	Hon. W. Lyttleton
Wm. Ord, esq.	J. M. Lloyd
Hon. C. Pelham	TELLERS.
D. North, esq.	Lord Folkestone
Henry Parnell, esq.	Hon. C. Hutchinson.
G. L. Wardle, esq.	

These are precious facts. They should be the subject of conversation in all families. Every man, who is well acquainted with them, should make it a point to see that twenty other men are made to understand the matter clearly. There needs no eloquence; no garnish of style to set off such facts. A man, who has facts like these to detail, can be under no temptation either to write or to speak any thing that can, by the utmost stretch of legal ingenuity and chicane, be tortured into a libel. Plain matter of fact is all that the nation wants; and of that, as far as my circulation extends, it shall have a plentiful supply.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.—On Monday, the 1st of this month, there was held, at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, in the Strand, London, a Meeting of “THE FRIENDS OF PARLIAMENTARY REFORM,” at which meeting SIR FRANCIS BURDETT presided.—The assemblage was very numerous, not less than from eleven to twelve hundred people dining upon the occasion; and, what is of still more importance to notice, thousands being assembled in the streets near the Tavern, without any expectation of seeing a gaudy show, or any thing merely calculated to please the eye. It was not to see Sir Francis Burdett, for every soul in London had seen him before. In part it might be to see MR. WARDLE; but, then, it was the principles, which had

made his person an object of curiosity. In short, I think, this unusual anxiety; these very rare marks of public interest, cannot be ascribed to any thing but the well-known cause of the meeting, and an earnest wish for the success of that cause.—It would be quite impossible for me to give, in my limited space, any thing like an analysis of the speeches at this meeting. I will, therefore, first insert the RESOLUTIONS that were passed; and will then make a few of those remarks, which I think the most likely to be useful.—

“At a Meeting of the Friends of such a Reform as would secure to the People the reality and uses of REPRESENTATION in PARLIAMENT, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, London, on Monday, 1st May, 1809.

“SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, Bart. M.P. in the Chair.—It was Resolved,

1. “That it is the grand principle of the Constitution, that the People shall have a share in the government, by a just representation in Parliament.

2. “That the long duration of Parliaments greatly facilitates the corruption of the Members, and removes that wholesome check or controul on their conduct, a frequent recurrence to the opinions of their Constituents.

3. “That in a Petition presented to the House of Commons on the 6th May 1793, it was offered to be proved at the Bar, that 154 individuals did, by their own authority, appoint or procure the return of 307 Members of that House, (exclusive of those from Scotland), who were thus enabled to decide all questions in the name of the whole people of Great Britain.

4. “That this Meeting believes individual patronage in Boroughs has increased since 1793;—that in those in which the voters are few, and which are called OPEN, the returns are for the most part obtained for money;—that the Representation for Scotland is extremely influenced;—and that there are great defects in that of Ireland: and it is the opinion of this Meeting, that a great majority of the Members of the Commons House are so returned that the nation is not constitutionally represented; though it is taxed to support an expenditure of seventy millions sterling a year.

5. “That in the Act (commonly called the Act of Settlement) which placed the House of Brunswick on the Throne

" of these Realms, it was asserted and recognised as the Constitutional principle, " That no person who has an Office or " Place of Profit under the King, or receives a Pension from the Crown, shall " be capable of serving as a Member of " the House of Commons."

6. " That it appears by a Report laid on the table of the House of Commons in June last, that 78 of its Members are in the regular receipt under the Crown of 178,994*l.* a-year.

7. " That in 1782, it was declared by Mr. Pitt in the House of Commons, that " seven or eight Members of that House " were sent there by the Nabob of Arcot, " and that a foreign State in enmity to " this country might procure a party to " act for it under the mask and character " of Members of that House."

8. " That such a state of representation is a national grievance.

9. " That in every department of the State into which inquiry has been made, " scandalous corruptions and abuses have " been detected.

10. " That the exclusion of the public voice from all influence in, and the consequent corruption of, the Governments of the Continental States, have been the causes of their subjugation.

11. " That so long as the People shall not be fairly represented, corruption will increase; our debts and taxes will accumulate; our resources will be dissipated; the native energy of the people will be depressed; and the country deprived of its best defence against foreign foes.

12. " That to remedy the great and glaring evils of which we complain, it is not necessary to have recourse to theoretical speculations, or dangerous experiments in Government, but to recur to the principles handed down to us by the wisdom and virtue of our forefathers.

13. " That the remedy is to be found, and to be found only, in a full and fair Representation of the People in the Commons House of Parliament; a remedy equally necessary to the safety of the Throne, and the happiness and independence of the country.

14. " That we therefore recommend to every Town, City, and County, to take the state of the Representation into consideration, and urgently, but temperately, to apply to Parliament to adopt such measures as shall secure to the Nation the reality and uses of Representation.

" FRANCIS BURDETT, Chairman."

Upon the Resolutions themselves, being nothing more or less than a chain of undeniable and notorious truths, I will offer only this observation; that, without any view of pertinacity of opinion, I think petitions to the king the most natural mode of proceeding; because, the cause is not less the cause of His Majesty than of his people, and because it appears to me not natural to call upon an assembly to purge itself. MR. STUART, of the Courier, whom I respect for his manly conduct during the recent enquiry, has asked me, whether I wish the king to do, as CROMWELL did, go to the House and turn the members out. This is very well as a jest; but, in sober earnest it is very foolish. No, Mr. Stuart knows, that I wish for no such thing. I wish His Majesty to recommend, in a speech to the Parliament, in like manner as he recommends other measures to them, an act, or acts, to reform the House of Commons agreeably to the constitution of the kingdom; and, I prefer this mode, because then the king would take the lead in the effecting of an object so dear to the hearts of his people; and, I am the more disposed to this, because I have heard, and that, too, from very good authority, that the king has, at various times, expressed his perfect readiness to see such a reform take place.—But, after all, there is not perhaps, much in the mere mode of making the application. The main thing is the set of principles, upon which we act; and, as we are all agreed as to them, there can be no difference of any consequence, in other respects.—The speech of Sir Francis Burdett was the very best I have ever read. The whole was good. I see not one word that I would wish to have left out. Full of sound constitutional principles, most aptly applied and ably illustrated.—MR. STUART of the Courier calls the assembly "BURDETTITES," which name, as a catch-word, he seems disposed to apply to all the friends of Parliamentary Reform. He formerly called us "Jacobins;" but of that he is, especially since the disclosures relating to John Bowles, Dr. O'Meara, and Mr. Beazely (all famous *Anti-Jacobins*) now ashamed. But, what does he mean, by this catch word? Does he mean, that Sir Francis Burdett meditates a destruction of the monarchy? And does he think, that any man in the kingdom will now believe this? Besides, was not Lord Cochrane one of this assembly, and did he not go as far as any one in support of the principles, upon which the assembly was acting? Was

not Mr. Wardle there, too, he, who has received and is receiving the praise of the whole nation, and of no one more warmly than of Mr. Stuart? Are Major Cartwright and Mr. Maddocks men to entertain views hostile to the settled order of law and property? Or are these gentlemen, and hundreds of other men of large property, who were present, such fools as not to perceive the drift of that *cunning, crafty* person, Sir Francis Burdett?—But, the *COURIER* allows, that a reform of the House of Commons is a very *desirable* thing, and a thing which the editor wishes to see brought about; but, he suggests, that a *time of war* is not the *proper time*. The truth is, that the time has always been found improper by those who wished it never to take place, and who had not boldness enough to deny the necessity of it. Let us examine, then, into the validity of this objection in point of time.—If to reform the House of Commons was one of those measures or enterprizes, which would necessarily draw off any portion, however small, of the resources of the kingdom, either in men or in money, then I should say, that the objection might be valid; because, in time of war, these are wanted for the purposes of national defence. The purchasing of so many buildings and pulling them down, in order to beautify the environs of the House of Commons in time of war, might, upon this ground, have been objected to, though it never was. Many other things of the same sort, or something similar at least, might be mentioned. If the reform of the parliament required any maritime enterprize to accompany it, then a time of war might be a bad time. But no resources either of men or of money does this measure demand; and, as far as I am able to discover, not the smallest obstructions to the operations of war could it possibly produce. “The attention of the government.” But, why should it engross the attention of the king’s ministers? Not to mention, that their *whole* time, for many *many* months past, has been engrossed by endeavours to defend those acts, which have proceeded solely from a want of such reform. Besides: for all great and important improvements, there is nothing like a time of public danger. It is precisely then that men are awake to the necessity of doing that, which, in times of no danger or embarrassment, they are too listless to attempt. It is when we most acutely feel the pain, that we have the courage to apply the remedy, and not in our intervals of comparative ease. We have, moreover,

the experience of our own country to sanction us. The Unions with Scotland and with Ireland were both effected in time of war; and, I remember, that, in the latter case, Lord Auckland *congratulated* the country upon the measure being undertaken in times of war, of difficulty, and of danger. And, if we believe, as we do believe, and as Mr. Stuart admits, that the *principle* of Parliamentary Reform is wise and just, and, of course, that the measure will be gratifying to the people, what, let me ask, would so forcibly tend to make the people patient under the heavy pressure created by the war, and to induce them to shed their blood in their country’s defence? There is no prospect, at present, of a safe termination to this war. Mr. Fox observed, that our measures should be calculated for twenty years duration of hostilities; though, poor man, he was dissuaded from the adoption of any such measures. When we look at the state of Europe; when we consider the age of Napoleon; when we view his character, his evident intentions, and the means he has to work with; when we take this survey, is it possible for us not to see the absolute necessity of placing our affairs at home upon a *permanent* and *solid footing*; and, I ask any man of sense, whether that is to be done without such a change as will gain the government the confidence of the people? I do not think it at all unlikely, that, with now-and-then a short interval of repose, the war may continue for another twelve or fifteen years. To settle in any thing like tranquillity so many new dynasties and orders of things cannot be the work of a few years. Those of us who are now in the prime of life will have beards of a very grizzly hue long before Europe will again know the blessings of real peace. And, I ask you, even you, Mr. Windham, who seem to be the most resolutely bent against any change in our internal state, whether you seriously believe, that this nation can, during such a conflict, preserve its independence, with such heart-burnings, such never-ceasing jealousies and suspicions, such universal distrust, as now prevail, and which will continue to prevail, until the people see themselves fully and fairly represented in the House of Commons? How vain have been all our attempts to stem the torrent of revolution, in every part of Europe! Victories we have sometimes gained; immense armies we have brought, by our money, into the field; we have formed leagues and covenants in abundance; we have roused to

war even those who seemed disposed to be quietly conquered; our all-persuading gold has made the wretchedest cowards upon earth expose their breasts to the bayonet; nor have we been wanting in bribing to our aid any passion or any folly of which the human heart is susceptible. But, still the fire of revolution goes on; and, instead of damping, we really seem to feed the flame. How narrow, then, how pitiful must be the mind, which can entertain the hope of any general or durable advantage from the efforts of the Wellesleys, for instance, in Spain and Portugal; or from any such attempts! Thus we go on, from day to day, from expedient to expedient, adopting any thing rather than that, which, by making us *sound at home*, would enable us to set the world at defiance. However men may disagree as to particular principles of politics, there is one generally prevailing persuasion; and that is, that, *as we are*, we cannot long continue. Some look forward to *peace* as the day of deliverance from danger; others, still more sanguine, entertain the mad hope of over-turning Napoleon; but, all agree, that, without some change in our favour, we cannot long proceed. Well, then, why fly to these uncertain sources of hope? Why not adopt a change completely within our power? A change which, though even the glorious navy were annihilated, would render England secure? —To return, for a moment, to the Meeting, I was not surprized to hear Mr. WILLIAM SMITH full of the “*difficulties*” attending our exertions; but, I am very far from agreeing with him in opinion. The country never saw the necessity of reform so plainly as it does *now*. That necessity is seen and felt, from one end of the kingdom to the other. There is but one opinion and one feeling amongst all well-informed men, not supported by the public money. This never was the case before. The thing is now demanded from a conviction of its necessity to preserve us from utter ruin; and, suppose it were to be a work of *years* instead of *months*, if we die ourselves without enjoying the fruit of our labour, we have children to leave behind us. Those who are now *boys* will soon be *men*; and, we should always bear in our minds, that, it is into their minds that our principles will be instilled.—*Steadiness in perseverance* is the most valuable quality in all enterprizes of this sort. There must be no hurry. The thing will not be hurried; but we must not *relax*, and above all things, we must not give way to pique or

disgust. We must resolve to be *forbearing* towards one another, always remembering, that our enemies are knit together by the double principle of guilt and fear.

MR. WHITE'S PETITION.—This Petition, which I have inserted below, I beg leave most earnestly to recommend to the attentive perusal of every reader. It contains matter of instruction as well as of information.—In my next I have some few observations to make with respect to it.—By those who really love their country, the case of this gentleman will never be forgotten; and, for presenting his Petition, Mr. Whitbread has my unfeigned thanks.

Botley, May 3.

PETITION OF MR. HENRY WHITE.—Presented to the House of Commons, by Mr. Whitbread, on the 24th of April, 1809.

SHEWETH,

That your Petitioner is the sole Proprietor of the Independent Whig Newspaper, which, from its first commencement, has been, and still is, printed at No. 23, in Warwick-square, within the said city of London: and that your Petitioner is now a prisoner in the County Gaol of the county of Dorset, in pursuance of the Sentence of the Court of Pleas, held before the King himself at Westminster, (usually called the Court of King's Bench) which sentence was pronounced at Westminster, a place not within the said City of London, contrary to the rights and privileges of the Citizens of the said City.

Your Petitioner published, in his said Newspaper in Warwick-square, within the said City, in the months of December, 1807, and January, 1808, certain Letters, signed “T. C.” “Humanitas,” “A Sea-man,” and “Junius,” for which Publications criminal Informations were filed, *ex officio*, against your Petitioner by the King's Attorney-General, in Hilary Term, 1808, at Westminster, a place without the said City of London, although a Grand Jury of the Citizens of the said City was sitting at the very time within the said City; in which Informations, it was alledged that the above named Publications were scandalous and malicious libels, though the said Publications were not alledged to be in any particular false or untrue. Now it is not only the privilege of the Citizens of the said City, but the acknowledged right of every subject of the British empire who is accused of crimes and misdemeanors, to have an Indictment preferred before the best men of his County, who are

[693]

to determine whether there be sufficient cause to put him on his trial; but, as a Grand Jury is not always sitting, and as danger might arise to the State in some cases from the delay of assembling a Grand Jury, the practice of filing a criminal Information before the King at Westminster has been tacitly conceded to the Attorney-General of the Crown, at such times as no Grand Jury shall be assembled; but it has never been contended that the subject should be deprived of the privilege of having his case submitted to a Grand Jury of his County, before he be put upon his trial, except where pernicious consequences to the State would arise from the delay of calling together such Jury; but this could not obtain in the case of your Petitioner, because a Grand Jury of his County, namely, of the City of London, were actually sitting at the very time the criminal Informations were filed against him at Westminster.

Your Petitioner humbly craves leave to remind your honourable House that it was not even alledged in the said criminal Informations that the matter which gave rise to them was false or untrue, though the matter was alledged to be scandalous and malicious, and that it was the usage of the Court of King's Bench, till within the last forty years, not to permit any Information to be filed for libellous matter, which was not alledged to be *false* as well as *malicious*, and indeed the most recent determination on the subject coincides with the opinions uniformly maintained by our ancestors; for, in the case of Sir John Carr, and Hood and Sharpe, the Plaintiff did not recover in action for a publication which was true, though admitted to be malicious and injurious.

Your Petitioner having had a criminal information filed against him, of the nature, and under the circumstances above stated, the Solicitor for the Crown moved for a Special Jury, to which motion the Judges of the Court of King's Bench acceded, and a Special Jury was awarded of such Freeholders who were entered in the Freeholders' Book belonging to the Sheriff, with the addition of Freeholder and Merchant, which Special Jury was struck, not by the Sheriff, but by the Master of the Crown-Office, who is a servant of the Crown,—the Prosecutor in this instance;—and the names were not taken as named by the said Master, but several were passed over after he had named them, *because he stated them to be not likely to attend*, thereby subverting one of the principles of British

justice, which directs that a Jury shall be *impartially* selected, and attendance enforced by fines of the Court; and, indeed, the Master of the Crown-Office might prevent all impartial persons from being summoned on a Jury destined to try between the Crown and the Subject, if every name be passed over which he determines to be a person not likely to attend. And this conduct of the Returning Officer is conceived to be strong presumptive evidence that he knows the characters of the persons to be summoned, and has the power of acting with partiality, which power is contrary to the Constitution of these realms, and is strongly guarded against by the laws, in cases where no attempts are made to take the trial out of the common course of justice; for, the Under-Sheriff (who summons Juries) cannot continue in office longer than one year, nor be re-chosen till after an interval of two years, lest, from his familiarity with office, he may be enabled to select a partial Jury.

Your Petitioner also reminds this Honourable House, that, by a Statute of the 7th and 8th year of King William 3, (ch. 32,) it is enacted, that "every summons of any person qualified to any " of the aforesaid services, (namely, serving on Juries,) shall be made by the " Sheriff, his Officer, or lawful Deputy, *six " days before*, at the least;" but in the case of your Petitioner, the summonses to the Jury were not delivered *six* days before the day of trial, nor *five* days before, nor *four* days before; from which cause your Petitioner was not able to avail himself of a trial before a Special Jury, contrary to the Rights of the Subject and the law of the land; and this circumstance of not summoning the Jury *six* days before the trial, contrary to the positive and explicit enactments of the law of the land, has prevented your Petitioner from being tried by a Jury of such men as had been assigned him as his Peers.

Your Petitioner was not tried by a Jury of his Peers; for, as the Court of King's Bench had ruled that a Jury of Freeholders and Merchants were his Peers, it necessarily follows that those who were neither Freeholders nor Merchants could not be his Peers; and yet those who were added to the Special Jury were neither Freeholders nor Merchants, and therefore were not his Peers:—and of a Jury composed of men who were all of them neither Peers of your Petitioner, nor Peers among themselves, a verdict was given.

Your Petitioner also craves the attention of this Honourable House, to the words used by sir Nash Grose on the trial, in his charge to the Jury, which your Petitioner humbly presumes to have been a deviation from the spirit of the Constitution, which enjoins lenity and impartiality to form the basis of the conduct of every British Judge, to have been also inimical to the letter and fair interpretation of the Act of Parliament entitled "An Act to remove doubts respecting the functions of Juries in cases of *Libel*," which Act directs, that "on every such trial, the Court or Judge before whom such Indictment or Information shall be tried, shall, according to his or their discretion, give their or his opinion and directions to the Jury in the matter in issue between the King and the Defendant or Defendants, *in like manner as in all other criminal cases.*"—Your Petitioner therefore prays to submit, for the decision of this Honourable House, the propriety or impropriety of the following words, as used by sir Nash Grose on this occasion, and which instead of delivering an opinion or direction, "*as in all other criminal cases,*" are conceived by your Petitioner to be unprecedented in the annals of modern British jurisprudence. The words that your Petitioner complains of, and which were taken down at the time by Mr. Farquharson, the short-hand writer, are as follows:—"In order to shew that they are *most wicked, gross, and abominable Libels*, it is only necessary to read, not ALL, but one or two of them. But, Gentlemen, under this Act of Parliament, I am to give you my opinion upon these Publications, and I have no hesitation in saying that any thing more libellous I never heard read: in my opinion they are *gross, scandalous, and abominable Libels!*"

Your Petitioner humbly submits to the benignity of this Honourable House, whether these words ought not to have been considered, in strict impartiality, as sufficiently strong, in giving the opinion and direction of the Judge as warranted by the Act of Parliament above alluded to, without the addition of the following unprecedented expression:—"But, really, Gentlemen, I think it will be throwing dust in your eyes if I say I entertain the least doubt on the subject."—Your Petitioner humbly submits, whether an opinion and direction of the Judge thus given, and that without having read a tittle of the Libels in question, or the defence that had been urged to the Jury, comes within

the meaning either of the Letter of the Law, or the Spirit of the British Constitution. And the necessity of a Jury being Peers among themselves as well as Peers to the Defendant, has been ever recognized and insisted upon by the British Constitution, because, otherwise, the master and the servant, the creditor and the debtor, the employer and employed, might be inclosed in the same Jury Box, in which case it would imply an absurdity to assert that such Jury were Peers among themselves; for, the same individuals could not at the same time be both dependants and equals; and, if a Jury be not Peers among themselves, they cannot ALL be Peers to the Defendant, and their verdict may not be a free and unbiassed verdict.

And forasmuch as it is enacted by the Bill of Rights that "Jurors ought to be duly empannelled and returned;" and as no Juror can be duly returned who is not summoned six days at least before the day of trial, the Jurors summoned not four days before the trial of your Petitioner, were not duly returned.

And forasmuch as it is the privilege of the citizens of the city of London to be tried and adjudged within the said city, though your Petitioner has been tried (if the issue committed to a Jury not duly impannelled and returned can be called a trial,) yet he has not been adjudged within the said city, contrary to the privileges of the citizens of the said city, and, therefore, such judgment being contrary to these privileges, is contrary to the Law of the Land, which has confirmed and established them.

And forasmuch as your Petitioner, if adjudged within the said city, could only have been adjudged to confinement within the prisons of the Sheriffs of the said city and county of Middlesex, it follows that a judgment which implies banishment from the said city, as well as confinement, is contrary to the lawful privileges of the citizens of the city, and when pronounced on a citizen in a place without the said city, for an alleged offence committed within the said city, is believed to be a violation of the Law of the Land, which acknowledges and confirms these privileges.

Your Petitioner also humbly craves leave to observe that the measure of punishment assigned to him for the publication of the said Letters is equal to the measure of punishment assigned in any case where the Libel was proved to be

7] else, though the truth of the publications of your Petitioner has never been called in question.

Your Petitioner also humbly states, that, when he was removed from the prison of the Court of King's Bench to the County Gaol of Dorchester, he was consigned to the Magistrates' custody, as will appear from an Order of Sessions, made at the Midsummer Quarter-Sessions for the County of Dorset, respecting his treatment in confinement, though by the Law of the Land, he could only be committed to the Sheriff's custody, (allowing for the sake of argument, that he might be imprisoned in a different county from that in which the offence was committed, and it is allowed for the sake of argument only). Now, the Magistrates of any county have no jurisdiction except what is given them by Statute, and no jurisdiction is given to them by Statute over a person convicted of misdemeanor, who is, during his confinement, *emphatically*, a Sheriff's Prisoner. Your Petitioner, therefore, is placed by his sentence in a situation which the law knows not, and therefore he prays the consideration of his case may receive the attention of this Honourable House, not on his personal account, but as his treatment may be drawn into a precedent inimical to the freedom and liberties of the Subjects of these realms.

That your Petitioner further submits to your Honourable House some peculiar privations and hardships to which he has been subjected since his confinement in Dorchester-Gaol, which commenced on the evening of the 6th of July, 1808, and when your Petitioner was labouring under a very severe and afflicting state of illness, which had been proved to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench by the affidavits of four most respectable Medical Gentlemen. That notwithstanding this infirm state of your Petitioner's health, he was denied, by the controlling Magistrates of Dorchester prison, for the interval of more than three months, viz. from the 6th of July to the 15th of the ensuing October, all access to the open air, even to the taking ordinary exercise, unless your Petitioner would take the same in a small circular stone yard, which was allotted in common for prisoners who were sentenced for fines, such as Smugglers and those who had evaded the Excise-Laws, &c. &c. Your Petitioner's complaint being a long standing bilious disorder, attended with a complication of alarming symptoms, among which he was subject to an almost

continued swimming in the head, and a partial stagnation of the circulation of the blood in his feet, he found, after trial, that the walking on the stones and the circular direction in which he was obliged to walk aggravated his disorder to such an excess, that he was obliged to abandon the attempt; and, although he represented this frequently, by letter and otherwise, to the visiting Magistrates, and intreated that he might be permitted to walk in the garden, as Mr. Gilbert Wakefield, Mr. Redhead Yorke, and all other prisoners in similar situations, had been permitted to do before him, this was refused him, until he partially obtained the indulgence, through the benevolent interposition of Mr. Calcraft, one of the Magistrates for the County, and the representation being first made to him by the Medical Gentleman attending the prison, that he considered your Petitioner's being permitted to walk in the garden essential to the preservation of his health. In consequence of this interference and this representation, your Petitioner has, since the 15th of October last, been permitted to walk in the garden, in company of the Gaoler of the prison, for the very limited space of one half an hour every day, and which limited indulgence your Petitioner's health has been such as almost to preclude him from availing himself of. Your Petitioner, therefore, humbly submits to this Honourable House that such extreme coercion and restriction is not necessary for the secure confinement of your Petitioner, and is inconsistent with the benign spirit of the British Constitution. Your Petitioner, in candor and justice, begs leave to state that he considers this restriction as being personally cruel towards him, because, since his confinement in the Gaol of Dorchester, an unlimited indulgence in walking in the garden has been extended to a FELON, by the partial courtesy of the Magistrates, and your Petitioner having given no cause of complaint against the propriety of his conduct, to justify such restriction.

In addition to this heavy grievance, your Petitioner begs to state that his family consists of a wife and two sons:—that, from the enjoyment of all personal intercourse with one of his sons, whose business confines him in London, he is wholly bereaved, by the great distance which separates them:—that his wife and his other son have taken lodgings at Dorchester, at an immense increased expense to your Petitioner, for the purpose of mitigating his calamity as much as possible by the com-

forts of their society; but hitherto they have only been admitted, by the order of the Magistrates, alternately to visit him for three days in a week, and each day limited to eight hours, with the exception of your Petitioner's wife, for some weeks past, having been permitted to be with him on a Sunday, and during the night, in consequence of the Medical Gentleman attending him having given it as his opinion that it was indispensibly necessary, on account of the alarming state of your Petitioner's health.

Your Petitioner trusts that this Honourable House will liberally consider what a cruel aggravation this must be, merely arising from the local rules of the Magistrates, and neither expressed in the sentence, nor warranted by the Bill of Rights; for, surely every father and husband must deem that imprisonment cruel which confines a man for three years, and allows him only twenty-four hours in each week to have intercourse with his wife and child. That your Petitioner has confined himself, in these instances, to a simple statement of facts, and commits the whole to the benignity, discretion, and wisdom, of your Honourable House.

Your Petitioner submits to the consideration of this Honourable House, the extreme severity of the sentence passed upon him, as being contrary to the Rights and Liberties of every British subject in these realms, guaranteed to them by the Bill of Rights, which expressly says, "that excessive fines ought not to be imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted," your Petitioner having already suffered, under a state of severe and dangerous illness, upwards of nine months imprisonment and banishment in Dorchester-Gaol, from his home, his business, and the County where he was tried, and which has already subjected him to a pecuniary expense of upwards of £.500, and which, unless mitigated by the interference of this Honourable House, it is more than probable will prove fatal to the life of your Petitioner, and ruinous to his circumstances, and future welfare of his family.

And your Petitioner most humbly craves that he may be permitted to prove the truth of his allegation before a Select Committee, or at the Bar of your Honourable House, and he prays such relief as in your wisdom shall seem meet.

HENRY WHITE.

PROCEEDINGS

IN COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHs, &c. re-

lative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 658.)

BURGH OF ANNAN, (continued.)

2. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Francis Burdett, bart., lord visc. Folkestone, J. C. Curwen, esq., S. Whitbread, esq., general Fergusson, and sir S. Romilly, knt., and to the other members, who voted in support of Mr. Wardle's motion, and to the Minority who spoke or voted against the motion of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

3. Resolved unanimously, That the Evidence lately brought before the House of Commons—the discussion that followed on that evidence—and the decision of the majority, afford the most convincing proof that such a Reform as will place the ministers of the crown under the controul of an independant and vigilant Parliament, consisting of the true representatives of the people, is essentially necessary to the safety of this kingdom; and in short, that all the steps which have hitherto been taken in this most momentous affair, are of no avail, but as they stand preparatory to a radical Reform in the Commons House of Parliament.

4. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the independent Citizens of London and Westminster, for the manly and patriotic manner, in which they have come forward on the present occasion, as well as upon others of a similar nature, with a free expression of their sentiments, thereby affording a glorious example to the other inhabitants of the kingdom. And the Meeting are impelled by their feelings to express a hope, that these patriotic bodies of men will persevere in the noble cause they have espoused, and which from their local situation they are so well calculated to maintain, until corruption, chased from all its hiding places, shall have fled the country, and left the constitution to operate on its true and genuine principles.

5. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Richard Forest, esq., Provost of this Burgh, for the promptness and alacrity with which he acquiesced in the request to call the present Meeting; and to Bailie Scott, the Chairman of the Meeting, for the becoming manner in which he has conducted himself while in the Chair.

6. Resolved unanimously, That these Resolutions be signed by the Chairman, and inserted in a London newspaper, and

in such of the provincial papers as will give sufficient publicity to the sentiments they contain—(Signed) JAMES SCOTT, Chairman.

BOROUGH OF CARMARTHEN.

At a Meeting of the Mayor, Burgesses, and respectable Inhabitants of the said Borough, held at the Guildhall, in the said Borough, on the 5th of April, 1809, convened in pursuance of a requisition delivered to the Mayor of the said Corporation for a Common Hall to consider of the propriety of addressing a Vote of Thanks to COLONEL WARDLE, for his conduct in Parliament on a late occasion.—WILLIAM MORGAN, esq. Deputy Mayor, in the Chair. It was unanimously Resolved,

That conscious of the blessings we derive from the Constitution under which we live, and anxious to perpetuate them pure and unsullied, we cannot but look on every man who has courage and manliness to oppose the inroad of corruption, and stem the torrent of vice, by which its excellencies are perverted, and even its vitality endangered, as the best friend to the Throne, the truest friend to his country. Impressed with this conviction, we cannot but be sensible of the services rendered by Col. Wardle, who, with unexampled intrepidity and most persevering industry, so eminently, and so honourably displayed on a late occasion in Parliament, instituted and prosecuted inquiries into abuses tending to the degradation of the Army, and subversive of its dearest interests; which, in opposition to every discouragement and difficulty, he made manifest to the nation, and for which he is justly entitled to the approbation and acknowledgments of every well-wisher to his King and his Country. We, therefore, participating in the general sentiment of gratitude such patriotism merits, and in some degree also actuated by a laudable, though national feeling of pride and exultation, that the object of this Address derives his origin from Cambrian Blood, beg leave to tender to G. L. Wardle, esq. our grateful acknowledgments for the services done to his country: and while we thus cordially return him our thanks, we cannot but regret that, restricted as we are by the Constitution of our Charter, we are prevented from gratifying our warmest wishes in presenting to so honourable and independent a character the Freedom of our ancient Borough.

Resolved, That the Thanks of this Meeting, as well as of the whole country, are justly due to sir F. Burdett, bart. lord

visc. Folkestone, S. Whitbread, esq. sir S. Romilly, knt. general Ferguson, and the rest of the glorious Minority, who so ably supported Col. Wardle through his arduous undertakings in the late Investigation.

TOWN OF SHEFFIELD.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of Sheffield (at which not less than Five Thousand Persons were assembled), convened by public Advertisement, and held this day April 12, at the Cutlers'-hall, and adjourned from thence to Paradise-square, Mr. E. RHODES, Master Cutler, in the Chair.

It was Resolved unanimously,—1. That, ardently as we wish to promote the welfare and prosperity of our country, and warmly attached as we are to its true Constitutional Government, we cannot but deeply lament, that such shameful instances of corruption, such undue influence, and such unwarrantable practices, should ever have existed, as have been developed by the late proceedings of the House of Commons.

Resolved unanimously,—2. That Gwyllym Lloyd Wardle, esq., by instituting the Inquiry which has brought this scene of corruption before the judgment of the public, has deserved eminently well of his country, and that the Thanks of this Meeting, with feelings of respectful gratitude, be presented to him for the manly, firm, and independent manner in which, amidst great discouragements; undaunted by threats of infamy and heavy responsibility; equally unconnected with, and unsupported by party—he has conducted this important and patriotic Inquiry.

Resolved unanimously,—3. That we also wish to convey the Approbation and the Thanks of this Meeting to sir Francis Burdett, who seconded Mr. Wardle's Motion, to lord Folkestone, Mr. Whitbread, sir Samuel Romilly, general Ferguson, admiral Markham, and all those Members of the House of Commons who voted in the Minorities on the several questions which arose in the course of this most interesting Investigation.

Resolved unanimously,—4. That the particular Thanks of this Meeting be given to William Wilberforce, esq., and the right hon. lord visc. Milton, the two Representatives of this extensive and populous county, for the discriminating and independent sanction and support afforded by them to Mr. Wardle, in his meritorious efforts to detect and counteract

abuses so injurious to the real interests of the Government, and so detrimental to the welfare of the people.

Resolved unanimously,—5. That, we thus openly express our sentiments, conceiving it to be the duty of a Free People, when strongly urged by transactions which materially affect the essential interests of the whole community, to declare their opinions, unbiassed by party consideration, in order that independent men may be thereby encouraged steadily to pursue those just, rational, and constitutional measures which will eventually root out every species of corruption, and prevent the repetition of similar evil practices, and which will also prove an effectual security against a profuse and unnecessary expenditure of public money.

Resolved unanimously,—6. That these Resolutions be transcribed on parchment, and remain for signatures at the Cutlers' Hall, for 14 days from the date hereof.

Resolved unanimously,—7. That these Resolutions be printed and published in Hand-bills, in the Sheffield Papers, and otherwise, as the Chairman and the Gentlemen who moved the Resolutions may direct.—E. RHODES.

WORCESTER, APRIL 13, 1809.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Freemen and other Inhabitants of this City in Common Hall assembled, pursuant to Public Notice, in order to consider of the Propriety of coming to certain Resolutions relative to the late Investigation into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Land Forces.—HERBERT ROGERS, esq. Mayor, in the Chair.—The following Resolutions were agreed to;

Resolved unanimously, 1. That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the late Investigation into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Land Forces, has disclosed the existence of gross Abuses and Corruption in that and other Departments of the State.

2. Resolved unanimously, That Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., for the dauntless intrepidity displayed by him in proposing the said Investigation, and for the cool, yet steady perseverance with which he conducted himself to the termination thereof, is entitled to the Thanks of this Meeting, and in their estimation to the gratitude of his Country.

3. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting are in a special manner due to sir Francis Burdett, bart.; to lord viscount Folkestone, to lord viscount Althorpe, to S. Whitbread, esq., to sir S. Romilly, to major general Ferguson, and to C. W. Wynne, esq., for their able, manly, and patriotic exertion on the above occasion.

4. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to our worthy Representatives, William Gordon, esq., and A. Roberts, esq., to the first for the Vote which he so honourably gave with Mr. Wardle; and the latter for the conscientious and correct view, which it appears by a letter now produced from him, he held upon the occasion, but which we are sorry to learn his ill state of health prevented him from following up with his vote.

5. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the hon. William H. Lyttelton, M. P. for this County, to the hon. Andrew Foley and sir Thomas Winnington, bart. M. P. for the Borough of Droitwich, and to Humphry Haworth, esq., M. P. for the Borough of Evesham, both within this County, and to the other Members composing the Minority of 125 who divided with Mr. Wardle.

6. Resolved unanimously, That his Royal Highness the Duke of York, by resigning his situation of Commander in Chief, has acted in conformity with the wishes of the people in opposition to the Majority of the House of Commons, and it is the opinion of this Meeting, that if any Person, at any future period, should advise his Majesty to reinstate him, he will, by such advice, prove himself an enemy to his Country.

7. Resolved, That the late Decision in the House of Commons has disappointed the hopes and expectations of the people, and convinces us of the necessity of a speedy and effectual Reform in the Representation of the Commons in Parliament, as a security to the Throne, a support to the nobility, and a safe-guard to the people against that tide of corruption, which has laid so many nations of Europe prostrate at the feet of the ruler of France.

The above Resolutions were carried by a large Majority.—(Signed) HERBERT ROGERS, Chairman and Mayor.

(To be continued.)